

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended in three important aspects. First, as requested by the Office, the designations “X” and “n” have been defined. The claim has been reworded in accordance with these definitions.

Second, the claim has been amended to require that Ar¹ is a six-membered ring. This will clearly distinguish the cited art.

Third, the claim has been amended to conform with applicants’ election. X is defined only as C and n is defined as 2-5.

Claim 7 has been amended to make explicit that a pharmaceutically acceptable salt is included. Claim 5 has been canceled in accordance with applicants’ election.

As it was indicated that the method claims dependent on any allowable composition claims would be rejoined, an amendment has been made to these claims as well by replacing claim 20 with claim 21 which is of the same scope.

As the amendments are made only for clarification and further to limit the claim to distinguish from the art, no new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Formal Matters

As noted above, the claims have been amended in accordance with the restriction requirement and applicants are aware that the method claims may be rejoined. Applicants appreciate acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted 30 May 2006.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Paragraph 2

It is believed that the amendment to claim 1 is responsive to this and obviates this rejection.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

It is believed that the amendment to claim 1 also disposes of this art rejection as applied to claims 1-4 and 6. The cited document, Knegtel, *et al.*, WO 02/22601 discloses only compounds where the substituent corresponding to Ar¹ is a five-membered ring. There is substantial exemplary support in the present application for the requirement that Ar¹ be a six-membered ring and this clearly avoids anticipation by Knegtel.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This basis for rejection is evidently grounded in the concept that anticipation may be avoided by individual compounds represented by the substituent set forth in claims 2-4 but that these compounds are not patentable over the generic formulas set forth in Knegtel. In view of the amendment to the claims, it is believed that this concept is no longer applicable. There is no question that a six-membered aromatic ring, as required for Ar¹, is not suggested by the *mandatory* pyrazole ring which Knegtel teaches is an absolute requirement. In view of the teaching of Knegtel that the pyrazole ring is a requisite for activity, compounds lacking this essential feature are clearly not suggested by the cited document. Accordingly, applicants believe this rejection, too, may be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The claims have been amended to read only on the elected invention and in response to the outstanding rejections. Applicants appreciate the indication that claim 7 is allowable over the art. Applicants believe, in view of the amendments to the claims, that claims 1-4 and 6 are also patentable over the art. In view of this, claims 8-19 and 21 are requested to be rejoined and all claims passed to issue.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket No. 219002030500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 22, 2006

By: Kate H. Murashige
Kate H. Murashige
Registration No. 29,959
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive
Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5112
Facsimile: (858) 720-5125